



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Scriptures are wholly inerrant or not? That there is not absolute inerrancy in the Bible is a matter of fact. No ingenuity can reconcile 2 Kings 8 : 26 and 2 Chron. 22 : 2, or 1 Sam. 12 : 11 and Heb. 11 : 32. The problems associated with the quotation of the Old Testament in the New cannot be solved on any such theory. The varying reports of our Lord's words, as given in the several Gospels, are instructive in this connection. But these discrepancies are largely due to errors in transcription. Serious inconsistencies between one part of Scripture and another, or between the statements of Scripture and the certain conclusions of profane knowledge, are *not* proved. And certain supposed errors in the Bible are very apt to show themselves truth upon further research.

Confusion results from the use of the expression "inerrant," as applied to the Scriptures, without any further definition. One always wants to ask, *in what respects* inerrant? A says, in respect of word, figures, geography, the minutest literary, scientific and circumstantial details, as well as of the more important things. B says, inerrant in respect of its essential teachings, so that they contain a revelation from God to man which becomes his ultimate standard of belief and conduct. A and B will both affirm inerrancy of the Scriptures; whereupon A denies B the right to use the term, and B proceeds to question A's familiarity with the phenomena of the Biblical history. If Principal Cave is correct—and his discussion seems to reach the root of the matter,—both were fighting for an inconsequential post, while the real battle has moved to another part of the field. The vital problem grants a certain degree and kind of errancy, and then asks: can an inerrant revelation, absolutely infallible, be transmitted by a vehicle which is fallible and errant, so proved in at least some respects?

The Teaching of Jesus as related to that of the Apostles.* Though we have secondary sources of information, the Old Testament and the record of its own enlarging life, the Church chiefly depends for its knowledge of Christianity upon the two prime sources, the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of his apostles. Which of these deserves precedence over the other as regards authority and value? Their mutual relation forces this question upon one, for they are not contemporaneous, nor are they coördinate, and the themes with which they deal are not mutually exclusive; furthermore, the teaching is, in each case, greatly influenced as regards both form and substance by the historical conditions under which it was given, though in both cases it gives an answer to the fundamental question what right religion is. To which teaching belongs the higher, the supreme place? (1) Some think the question unnecessary and use both sources indiscriminately in building up a theological structure. (2) Some give precedence to the apostolic teaching, holding that only in connection with the founding and development of the Church could Christianity be given in its entirety as a system. (3) But the first class are not in step with biblical study, and the second are contradicted by the apostles themselves, who give to Christ and his teaching the supreme place. To attribute absolute truth to Jesus' religious ideas is to believe that they take precedence of those of all other men, his apostles included. The special illumination given to some of his disciples did not raise them to equality with him as teachers of divine truth. Yet this does not call in question the true inspiration of his apostles, nor does it imply that the apostolic teaching needs to be corrected in any of its important features by comparison with the teaching of Jesus.

This is a fundamental question in Biblical Theology, as related to the New Testament. The position taken here, by which the teaching of Jesus is made the prime source of knowledge concerning Christianity, is the one which is most historical and reasonable. It is held by the leading scholars in this comparatively new department of biblical study. From a careful working out of this relation subsisting between the teaching of the Master and his disciples some new light will surely be thrown upon Christian truth.

* Editorial in *Andover Review*, Jan. 1892.